

RANDY JOHNSON,)	Case No. 2:14-cv-01326-JCM-NJK
)	
Plaintiff(s),)	ORDER
)	
vs.)	(Docket No. 44)
)	
JAMES COX, et al.,)	
)	
Defendant(s).)	
)	

Plaintiff's motion is defective in numerous respects. First, the deadline to amend the pleadings expired July 2, 2015 and discovery has been closed since August 3, 2015. Docket No. 16 at 2. Sufficient explanation for not complying with the scheduling order has not been provided. Second, Plaintiff seeks that the new allegations be added to the operative pleading in this case, *see* Docket No. 44 at 2-4 (purporting to add "additional facts of the case"), which is improper. *See, e.g., Strong v. Woodford*, 428 F. Supp. 2d 1082, 1087 (C.D. Cal. 2006) (an amended pleading must be "complete in itself without reference"); Docket No. 30 at 1 ("The second amended complaint must also be complete

1 in itself, and should not refer back to any previous complaints or otherwise fail to properly plead each
2 claim that is before the Court”). Third, it appears that the allegations presented relate to new instances
3 of alleged retaliation since the filing of this case, *see, e.g.*, Docket No. 44 at 2 (alleging misconduct
4 “[s]ince Plaintiff’s . . . initial 1983 complaints”), but Plaintiff fails to explain why such allegations are
5 properly added to this case rather than being litigated through the initiation of a new case with a separate
6 complaint.

7 For each of these reasons, the pending motion to file a supplemental complaint is **DENIED**
8 without prejudice.

9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 DATED: February 24, 2016

11 
12 _____
13 NANCY J. KOPPE
14 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26